

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 4

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 15 - 25 and 37 are pending in the application and have been rejected.

In order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, claim 15 has been amended. Specifically the subject matter of claims 21, 22 and 24 was added to claim 15 and claims 21 – 23 are hereby canceled without prejudice. This amendment made claim 19 redundant and it too is canceled without prejudice

Claim 20 was amended to correct claim dependency.

Independent claim 24 was amended to be a dependent claim from claim 16.

Claim 37 is canceled without prejudice.

No other amendments were made.

The Telephone Interview

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner, Michael D. Yaary, for granting and attending the telephone interview, with Applicant's Representative, Heidi M. Brun, Reg. No. 34,504, on 12 January 2010. In the interview, there was a discussion of the language of amended Claim 15.

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 5

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 15 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Rickards (*US Patent 7,152,220*) in view of Frid-Nelson (*US Patent 5,740,444*) and rejected claims 16 – 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Rickards and Frid-Nelson in view of Fitzpatrick (*US Patent 7,039,677*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

This rejection is believed to be moot in view of the amendments to the claims and the Examiner's suggestions for an allowable claim. Accordingly, Applicant makes no comment concerning these references.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under Section 103 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

In Paragraph 18 on pages 6 – 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests language for claim 15 that would place the claim in condition for allowance.

While not all these suggested amendments were made to claim 15, the essence of the Examiner's suggestions was used and it is, therefore, believed that claim 15 should now be in condition for allowance.

The reason for not using all the Examiner's language is because it was too wordy and made the claim too difficult to understand.

First, the Examiner suggests that the claim determine the "context" in which the user is operating. This is now incorporated in the claim.

Second, the Examiner then suggests identifying groups based on the context. Instead, Applicant now amends the claim to state that the peers are selected according to the context.

The Examiner's third suggestion of when the user changes code to change the discussion groups is not needed. As worded, the context is defined and then only peers

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 6

related to that context are displayed. Obviously, if the context changes, the list of peers changes. It is not necessary to limit the claim by stating this. This is self understood. Moreover, merely changing the code on which the user is working does not necessarily mean the context has changed.

In amending claim 15 to incorporate the suggestions of the Examiner, Applicant utilized the language of dependent claims 21 – 23, thereby maintaining the language heretofore used in the claims.

Therefore, since the Applicant has adopted the essence of the Examiner's suggestions, it is believed that the claims are now in the condition that the Examiner considered allowable. In view of the foregoing remarks, the pending claims 15 – 18, 20, 24 and 25 are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Response, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Suzanne Erez/
Suzanne Erez
Reg. No. 46,688
Phone No. 1-888-260-5928

Date: 15 February 2010
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218

Yorktown Heights, New York 10598